UNITED STATES PATENT AND TRADEMARK OFFICE

APPLICATION NO.	FILING DATE	FIRST NAMED INVENTOR	ATTORNEY DOCKET NO.	CONFIRMATION NO.
10/523,021	02/06/2006	Martin Moser	34874-135 NATL	7464

64280   7590   12/16/2009
MINTZ, LEVIN, COHN, FERRIS, GLOVSKY & POPEO, P.C.
ONE FINANCIAL CENTER
BOSTON, MA 02111

EXAMINER
LINDSEY, MATTHEW S

ART UNIT	PAPER NUMBER
2451	

MAIL DATE	DELIVERY MODE
12/16/2009	PAPER

Please find below and/or attached an Office communication concerning this application or proceeding.

The time period for reply, if any, is set in the attached communication.

-- The MAILING DATE of this communication appears on the cover sheet with the correspondence address --

Period for Reply

A SHORTENED STATUTORY PERIOD FOR REPLY IS SET TO EXPIRE _3_ MONTH(S) OR THIRTY (30) DAYS, WHICHEVER IS LONGER, FROM THE MAILING DATE OF THIS COMMUNICATION.
- Extensions of time may be available under the provisions of 37 CFR 1.136(a). In no event, however, may a reply be timely filed after SIX (6) MONTHS from the mailing date of this communication.
- If NO period for reply is specified above, the maximum statutory period will apply and will expire SIX (6) MONTHS from the mailing date of this communication.
- Failure to reply within the set or extended period for reply will, by statute, cause the application to become ABANDONED (35 U.S.C. § 133). Any reply received by the Office later than three months after the mailing date of this communication, even if timely filed, may reduce any earned patent term adjustment. See 37 CFR 1.704(b).

Status

1)☒ Responsive to communication(s) filed on _21 September 2009_.

2a)☒ This action is **FINAL**.   2b)☐ This action is non-final.

3)☐ Since this application is in condition for allowance except for formal matters, prosecution as to the merits is closed in accordance with the practice under *Ex parte Quayle*, 1935 C.D. 11, 453 O.G. 213.

Disposition of Claims

4)☒ Claim(s) _1-19 and 22_ is/are pending in the application.

    4a) Of the above claim(s) _____ is/are withdrawn from consideration.

5)☐ Claim(s) _____ is/are allowed.

6)☒ Claim(s) _1-19 and 22_ is/are rejected.

7)☐ Claim(s) _____ is/are objected to.

8)☐ Claim(s) _____ are subject to restriction and/or election requirement.

Application Papers

9)☐ The specification is objected to by the Examiner.

10)☐ The drawing(s) filed on _____ is/are: a)☐ accepted or b)☐ objected to by the Examiner.

    Applicant may not request that any objection to the drawing(s) be held in abeyance. See 37 CFR 1.85(a).

    Replacement drawing sheet(s) including the correction is required if the drawing(s) is objected to. See 37 CFR 1.121(d).

11)☐ The oath or declaration is objected to by the Examiner. Note the attached Office Action or form PTO-152.

Priority under 35 U.S.C. § 119

12)☐ Acknowledgment is made of a claim for foreign priority under 35 U.S.C. § 119(a)-(d) or (f).

    a)☐ All   b)☐ Some * c)☐ None of:

      1.☐ Certified copies of the priority documents have been received.

      2.☐ Certified copies of the priority documents have been received in Application No. _____.

      3.☐ Copies of the certified copies of the priority documents have been received in this National Stage application from the International Bureau (PCT Rule 17.2(a)).

    * See the attached detailed Office action for a list of the certified copies not received.

Attachment(s)

1)☒ Notice of References Cited (PTO-892)
2)☐ Notice of Draftsperson's Patent Drawing Review (PTO-948)
3)☐ Information Disclosure Statement(s) (PTO/SB/08)
    Paper No(s)/Mail Date _____.

4)☐ Interview Summary (PTO-413)
    Paper No(s)/Mail Date. _____.
5)☐ Notice of Informal Patent Application
6)☐ Other: _____.

DETAILED ACTION

1.   Claims 1-19 and 22 are pending in this application. Claims 1, 10, 11 and 22 are

amended and claims 20-21 are cancelled as filed on 21 September 2009.

Claim Rejections - 35 USC § 101

2.   35 U.S.C. 101 reads as follows:

> Whoever invents or discovers any new and useful process, machine, manufacture, or composition of
> matter, or any new and useful improvement thereof, may obtain a patent therefor, subject to the
> conditions and requirements of this title.

3.   Claims 1-14 and 20-22 are rejected under 35 U.S.C. 101 because the

claimed invention is directed to non-statutory subject matter.

4.   With respect to Claims 1-14 and 22, they are directed to a system but lack the

necessary physical articles or objects to constitute a machine or manufacture within the

meaning of 35 USC 101. They are not a series of steps or acts to be a process nor are

they a combination of chemical compounds to be a composition of matter. As such they

fail to fall within a statutory category.

Claim Rejections - 35 USC § 102

5.   The following is a quotation of the appropriate paragraphs of 35 U.S.C. 102 that

form the basis for the rejections under this section made in this Office action:

A person shall be entitled to a patent unless –

(e) the invention was described in (1) an application for patent, published under section 122(b), by another filed in the United States before the invention by the applicant for patent or (2) a patent granted on an application for patent by another filed in the United States before the invention by the applicant for patent, except that an international application filed under the treaty defined in section 351(a) shall have the effects for purposes of this subsection of an application filed in the United States only if the international application designated the United States and was published under Article 21(2) of such treaty in the English language.

6.   Claim 22 is rejected under 35 U.S.C. 102(e) as being anticipated by

Chowdry et al. (US 2003/0167315 A1).

7.   With respect to Claim 22, Chowdry disclosed: "A computer system for handling incremental data ([0234], lines 1-5, specifically individually refreshing portlets and Fig 3, where there are multiple portlets on a page), comprising:

one or more processors (Fig. 1 and [0094], where the system is implemented by computers) implementing a client-controller generating a modification-request ([0245], lines 1-4, where the user, or client, initiates the refresh manually);

a server-controller implemented on the one or more processors modifying a model of an application component on a server as a response to the modification-request ([0243], lines 1-3);

a server-renderer implemented on the one or more processors generating at least one browser-increment after the model has been modified ([0222], lines 1-8, where the cache server overwrites the original model with an updated model); and

a client-assembler implemented on the one or more processors receiving the at least one browser-increment from the server ([0243], lines 1-3 and Fig. 3, where each portlet can be updated independently) and updating an instance of a browser

component at the client with the at least one browser-increment, wherein the browser

component corresponds to the application component ([0243], lines 1-4 and Fig. 3,

where an updating a portlet monitoring the stock market, see Fig 3 'Market Chart' portlet

with corresponding 'Update' button in the title bar, will produce a modified portlet based

on changes in the stock market)".

Claim Rejections - 35 USC § 103

The following is a quotation of 35 U.S.C. 103(a) which forms the basis for all

obviousness rejections set forth in this Office action:

> (a) A patent may not be obtained though the invention is not identically disclosed or described as set
> forth in section 102 of this title, if the differences between the subject matter sought to be patented and
> the prior art are such that the subject matter as a whole would have been obvious at the time the
> invention was made to a person having ordinary skill in the art to which said subject matter pertains.
> Patentability shall not be negatived by the manner in which the invention was made.

8.   Claims 1, 4-11, 14-16 and 20-21 are rejected under 35 U.S.C. 103(a) as being

unpatentable over Chowdry in view of Kloba et al. (US 2001/0047394 A1).

9.   With respect to claim 1, Chowdry disclosed: "A computer system for handling

incremental data ([0234], lines 1-5, specifically individually refreshing portlets and Fig 3,

where there are multiple portlets on a page), comprising:

one or more processors (Fig. 1 and [0094], where the system is implemented by

computers) implementing a server-controller for receiving a modification-request from a

client ([0245], lines 1-4, where the user, or client, initiates the refresh manually) to

modify an original model of an application component that is stored on the server into a

modified model of the application component ([0243], lines 1-3);

a server-renderer implemented on the one or more processors for generating at

least one browser-increment that corresponds to a difference between the original

model and the modified model ([0222], lines 1-8, where the cache server overwrites the

original model with an updated model);

a client-assembler implemented on the one or more processors for receiving the

at least one browser-increment from the server ([0243], lines 1-3 and Fig. 3, where each

portlet can be updated independently) and updating at the client an original component

of a browser component with the at least one browser-increment resulting in a modified

component that corresponds to the modified model, wherein the original component

corresponds to the original model ([0243], lines 1-4 and Fig. 3, where an updating a

portlet monitoring the stock market, see Fig 3 'Market Chart' portlet with corresponding

'Update' button in the title bar, will produce a modified portlet based on changes in the

stock market); and

a client-controller implemented on the one or more processors for generating the

modification-request ([0245], lines 1-4, specifically the update button which, when

pressed, allows the user to initiate the refresh process)".

Chowdry did not explicitly state: "document object model (DOM) component".

However, Kloba disclosed: "document object model (DOM) component ([0171],

lines 1-4)".

One of ordinary skill in the art at the time of the invention would be motivated to combine the references because the system of Chowdry disclosed teachings pertaining to display of web pages or parts of web pages, portlets, in a portal or main web page. Kloba is directed to displaying an HTML document that conforms to the limitations of a viewer's browser.

Therefore it would have been obvious to one of ordinary skill in the art at the time of the invention to modify the portal system of Chowdry with the teachings of Kloba to include support for document object models. Motivation to combine these references comes from Kloba, where: "the client 108 is designed to support the additional Internet document standards: …. and the W3C DOM ([0171], lines 1-4)". Therefore, by combining the references one can use the Internet standard W3C DOM, using a standard ensures predictable behaviors across many different devices and platforms that may implement the invention.

10.   With respect to Claim 10, Chowdry disclosed: "A server for handling incremental data ([0234], lines 1-5, specifically individually refreshing portlets and Fig 3, where there are multiple portlets on a page), comprising:

one or more processors (Fig. 1 and [0094], where the system is implemented by computers) implementing a server-controller for receiving a modification-request from a client- controller of a client in a computer system ([0245], lines 1-4, where the user, or client, initiates the refresh manually) to modify an original model of an application

component that is stored on the server into a modified model of the application

component ([0243], lines 1-3); and

a server-renderer implemented on the one or more processors for generating at

least one browser-increment that corresponds to a difference between the original

model and the modified model ([0222], lines 1-8, where the cache server overwrites the

original model with an updated model);

the at least one browser-increment made to be sent to a client-assembler of the

client for updating an original component that corresponds to the original model with the

at least one browser-increment, resulting in a modified component that corresponds to

the modified model ([0243], lines 1-4 and Fig. 3, where an updating a portlet monitoring

the stock market, see Fig 3 'Market Chart' portlet with corresponding 'Update' button in

the title bar, will produce a modified portlet based on changes in the stock market)".

Chowdry did not explicitly state: "document object model (DOM) component".

However, Kloba disclosed: "document object model (DOM) component ([0171],

lines 1-4)".

One of ordinary skill in the art at the time of the invention would be motivated to

combine the references because the system of Chowdry disclosed teachings pertaining

to display of web pages or parts of web pages, portlets, in a portal or main web page.

Kloba is directed to displaying an HTML document that conforms to the limitations of a

viewer's browser.

Therefore it would have been obvious to one of ordinary skill in the art at the time

of the invention to modify the portal system of Chowdry with the teachings of Kloba to

include support for document object models. Motivation to combine these references

comes from Kloba, where: "the client 108 is designed to support the additional Internet

document standards: …. and the W3C DOM ([0171], lines 1-4)". Therefore, by

combining the references one can use the Internet standard W3C DOM, using a

standard ensures predictable behaviors across many different devices and platforms

that may implement the invention.

11.   With respect to Claim 11, Chowdry disclosed: "A client for handling incremental

data ([0234], lines 1-5, specifically individually refreshing portlets and Fig 3, where there

are multiple portlets on a page), comprising:

one or more processors (Fig. 1 and [0094], where the system is implemented by

computers) implementing a client-controller sending a modification-request to a server-

controller of a server in a computer system ([0245], lines 1-4, where the user, or client,

initiates the refresh manually); and

a client-assembler implemented on the one or more processors receiving at least

one browser-increment from the server ([0243], lines 1-3 and Fig. 3, where each portlet

can be updated independently) and updating an original component that corresponds to

an original model of an application component with the at least one browser-increment,

resulting in a modified component that corresponds to a modified model of the

application component ([0243], lines 1-4 and Fig. 3, where an updating a portlet

monitoring the stock market, see Fig 3 'Market Chart' portlet with corresponding

'Update' button in the title bar, will produce a modified portlet based on changes in the

stock market),

wherein the server-controller modifies the original model being stored on the

server into the modified model ([0222], lines 1-8, where the cache server overwrites the

original model with an updated model), and a server-renderer of the server generates

the at least one browser-increment that corresponds to a difference between the original

model and the modified model ([0244], lines 1-9)".

Chowdry did not explicitly state: "document object model (DOM) component".

However, Kloba disclosed: "document object model (DOM) component ([0171],

lines 1-4)".

One of ordinary skill in the art at the time of the invention would be motivated to

combine the references because the system of Chowdry disclosed teachings pertaining

to display of web pages or parts of web pages, portlets, in a portal or main web page.

Kloba is directed to displaying an HTML document that conforms to the limitations of a

viewer's browser.

Therefore it would have been obvious to one of ordinary skill in the art at the time

of the invention to modify the portal system of Chowdry with the teachings of Kloba to

include support for document object models. Motivation to combine these references

comes from Kloba, where: "the client 108 is designed to support the additional Internet

document standards: .... and the W3C DOM ([0171], lines 1-4)". Therefore, by

combining the references one can use the Internet standard W3C DOM, using a

standard ensures predictable behaviors across many different devices and platforms

that may implement the invention.

12.   With respect to Claim 15, Chowdry disclosed: "A method for handling incremental

data on a server ([0234], lines 1-5, specifically individually refreshing portlets and Fig 3,

where there are multiple portlets on a page), comprising:

receiving by a server-controller a modification-request from a client-controller

belonging to a client of a computer system ([0245], lines 1-4, where the user, or client,

initiates the refresh manually) to modify an original model of an application component

that is stored on the server into a modified model of the application component ([0243],

lines 1-3);

generating by a server-renderer at least one browser-increment that corresponds

to a difference between the original model and the modified model ([0222], lines 1-8,

where the cache server overwrites the original model with an updated model); and

sending the at least one browser-increment to a client-assembler of the client for

updating on the client an original component that corresponds to the original model with

the at least one browser-increment, resulting in a modified component that corresponds

to the modified model ([0243], lines 1-4 and Fig. 3, where an updating a portlet

monitoring the stock market, see Fig 3 'Market Chart' portlet with corresponding

'Update' button in the title bar, will produce a modified portlet based on changes in the

stock market)".

Chowdry did not explicitly state: "document object model (DOM) component".

However, Kloba disclosed: "document object model (DOM) component ([0171], lines 1-4)".

One of ordinary skill in the art at the time of the invention would be motivated to combine the references because the system of Chowdry disclosed teachings pertaining to display of web pages or parts of web pages, portlets, in a portal or main web page. Kloba is directed to displaying an HTML document that conforms to the limitations of a viewer's browser.

Therefore it would have been obvious to one of ordinary skill in the art at the time of the invention to modify the portal system of Chowdry with the teachings of Kloba to include support for document object models. Motivation to combine these references comes from Kloba, where: "the client 108 is designed to support the additional Internet document standards: .... and the W3C DOM ([0171], lines 1-4)". Therefore, by combining the references one can use the Internet standard W3C DOM, using a standard ensures predictable behaviors across many different devices and platforms that may implement the invention.

13.   With respect to Claim 16, Chowdry disclosed: "A method for handling incremental data on a client ([0234], lines 1-5, specifically individually refreshing portlets and Fig 3, where there are multiple portlets on a page) comprising the steps:

sending from a client-controller a modification-request to a server-controller of a

server of a computer system ([0245], lines 1-4, where the user, or client, initiates the

refresh manually); and

receiving by a client-assembler at least one browser-increment from the server

as a response to the modification request ([0243], lines 1-3 and Fig. 3, where each

portlet can be updated independently); and

updating an original component that corresponds to an original model of an

application component with the at least one browser-increment, resulting in a modified

component that corresponds to a modified model of the application component ([0243],

lines 1-4 and Fig. 3, where an updating a portlet monitoring the stock market, see Fig 3

'Market Chart' portlet with corresponding 'Update' button in the title bar, will produce a

modified portlet based on changes in the stock market), wherein the server-controller

modifies the original model being stored on the server into the modified model ([0243],

lines 1-3), and a server-renderer of the server generates the at least one browser-

increment that corresponds to a difference between the original model and the modified

model ([0222], lines 1-8, where the cache server overwrites the original model with an

updated model)".

Chowdry did not explicitly state: "document object model (DOM) component".

However, Kloba disclosed: "document object model (DOM) component ([0171],

lines 1-4)".

One of ordinary skill in the art at the time of the invention would be motivated to

combine the references because the system of Chowdry disclosed teachings pertaining

to display of web pages or parts of web pages, portlets, in a portal or main web page.

Kloba is directed to displaying an HTML document that conforms to the limitations of a

viewer's browser.

Therefore it would have been obvious to one of ordinary skill in the art at the time

of the invention to modify the portal system of Chowdry with the teachings of Kloba to

include support for document object models. Motivation to combine these references

comes from Kloba, where: "the client 108 is designed to support the additional Internet

document standards: .... and the W3C DOM ([0171], lines 1-4)". Therefore, by

combining the references one can use the Internet standard W3C DOM, using a

standard ensures predictable behaviors across many different devices and platforms

that may implement the invention.

14.   With respect to Claims 4 and 14, the combination of Chowdry and Kloba

disclosed: "wherein the client-controller instructs the client-assembler to reset the

original or modified DOM component upon receiving a reset-request (Chowdry, [0225],

lines 1-17, and Fig 7, where a user can recreate a portlet)".

15.   With respect to Claim 5, the combination of Chowdry and Kloba disclosed: "The

computer system according to claim 1, wherein the original model and the modified

model are defined by a component class selected from a group consisting of a Java

class, a Java Server Pages class (Chowdry, [0241], lines 7-11, where a java server

page is responsible for enabling the invention), a servlet class, a Pascal class, a C

class, a C++ class, and a Business Server Pages class".

16.   With respect to Claim 6, the combination of Chowdry and Kloba disclosed: "The

computer system according to claim 1, wherein the browser component is defined by a

component script class selected from a group consisting of a JavaScript class

(Chowdry, [0100], lines 1-5), a JavaApplets class and a VisualBasic Script class".

17.   With respect to Claim 7, the combination of Chowdry and Kloba disclosed: "The

computer system of claim 5, wherein the component class implements at least a portion

of the server-controller and the server-renderer (Chowdry, [0241] and [0242], where a

user requests to move a portlet from one location to another by dragging, and this

request is reflected in the portal using java server pages)".

18.   With respect to Claim 8, the combination of Chowdry and Kloba disclosed: "The

computer system of claim 6, wherein the component script class implements at least a

portion of the client-controller and the client-assembler (Chowdry, [0121], lines 4-8,

where a portlet can be implemented using javascript)".

19.   With respect to Claim 9, the combination of Chowdry and Kloba disclosed: "The

computer system of claim 6, wherein the component script class and a component class

have identical hierarchies (Kloba, [0171], lines 1-4, where DOM defines an hierarchy of

objects that will be uniform across the component script class and component class)".

The motivation to combine is the same as that indicated above in claim 1.

20.   Claims 2-3, 12-13 and 17-19 are rejected under 35 U.S.C. 103(a) as being

unpatentable over Chowdry and Kloba in view of Laane (2003/0066031 A1).

21.   With respect to Claims 2 and 12, the combination of Chowdry and Kloba did not

explicitly state: "wherein the client-controller stores the at least one browser-increment

in a cache-memory of the client and instructs the client-assembler to deactivate the at

least one browser-increment upon receiving a deactivation-request".

However, Laane disclosed: "wherein the client-controller stores the at least one

browser-increment in a cache-memory of the client ([0004], lines 1-5) and instructs the

client-assembler to deactivate the at least one browser-increment upon receiving a

deactivation-request ([0004], lines 12-14, the browser increment being deactivated by

returning to a previously loaded page)".

One of ordinary skill in the art at the time of the invention would be motivated to

combine the references because the system of Chowdry disclosed teachings pertaining

to browsing and updating web pages or portlets, in a portal or main web page using

frames. Laane is directed to a method for providing correct Back and Forward

navigation for web pages with frames.

Therefore it would have been obvious to one of ordinary skill in the art at the time

of the invention to modify the portal system of Chowdry and Kloba with the teachings of

Laane to include support for storing the browser increment in cache and deactivates the

browser increment upon a deactivation request. Motivation to combine these comes

from Laane, where: "If a particular desired page is already stored in the local memory,

then the stored page can be quickly retrived and displayed by the browser. Otherwise,

the desired page would need to be retrieved again from the web server and displayed"

(Laane, [0004], lines 12-16). Therefore by combining the references, one can quickly

retrieve the previously viewed page and need not request it again from the server.

22.   With respect to Claims 3 and 13, the combination of Chowdry, Kloba and Laane

disclosed: "wherein the client-controller retrieves the at least one browser-increment

from the cache-memory (Laane, [0004], lines 1-5) and instructs the client-assembler to

reactivate the at least one browser-increment upon receiving a reactivation-request

(Laane, [0004], lines 12-14)".

The motivation to combine is the same as that indicated above in claims 2 and

12.

23.   With respect to Claim 17, the combination of Chowdry and Kloba did not explicitly

state: "The method of claim 16, further comprising: storing the at least one browser-

increment in a cache-memory of the client".

However, Laane disclosed: "The method of claim 16, further comprising: storing

the at least one browser-increment in a cache-memory of the client ([0004], lines 1-5)".

One of ordinary skill in the art at the time of the invention would be motivated to

combine the references because the system of Chowdry disclosed teachings pertaining

to browsing and updating web pages or portlets, in a portal or main web page using

frames. Laane is directed to a method for providing correct Back and Forward

navigation for web pages with frames.

Therefore it would have been obvious to one of ordinary skill in the art at the time

of the invention to modify the portal system of Chowdry and Kloba with the teachings of

Laane to include support for storing the browser increment in cache and deactivates the

browser increment upon a deactivation request. Motivation to combine these comes

from Laane, where: "If a particular desired page is already stored in the local memory,

then the stored page can be quickly retrived and displayed by the browser. Otherwise,

the desired page would need to be retrieved again from the web server and displayed"

(Laane, [0004], lines 12-16). Therefore by combining the references, one can quickly

retrieve the previously viewed page and need not request it again from the server.

24.   With respect to Claim 18, the combination of Chowdry, Kloba and Laane

disclosed: "The method of claim 17, further comprising deactivating the browser-

increment upon the client-controller receiving a deactivation-request (Laane, [0004],

lines 12-14, the browser increment being deactivated by returning to a previously

loaded page)".

The motivation to combine is the same as that indicated above in claim 17.

25.   With respect to Claim 19, the combination of Chowdry, Kloba and Laane

disclosed: "The method of claim 18, further comprising: retrieving the at least one

browser-increment from the cache-memory (Laane, [0004], lines 1-5); and reactivating

the at least one browser-increment upon receiving a reactivation-request (Laane,

[0004], lines 12-14)".

The motivation to combine is the same as that indicated above in claim 17.

Response to Arguments

26.   Applicant's arguments filed 21 September 2009 have been fully considered but

they are not persuasive.

27.   Applicant argues: "The one or more processors are clearly physical articles or

objects" (pg 8, Rejections under 35 USC 101, lines 4-5).

Examiner respectfully disagrees. The claimed one or more processors can be

reasonably interpreted by one of ordinary skill in the art at the time of the invention as a

software component.

28.   Applicant further argues: "Chowdry fails to teach or suggest the claimed feature

of a server controller modifying a model of an application component on a server" (pg 9,

lines 18-20).

        Examiner respectfully disagrees. Chowdry disclosed the ability to refresh portlets

on a portal page (see [0243]). An application, as defined by IEEE 100 The Authoritative

Dictionary of IEEE Standards Terms Seventh Edition (hereinafter IEEE) is: "A computer

program that performs a function" (IEEE, pg 46, application, (5)). A portlet is a module

of content information that can be retrieved from web sources (see Chowdry, [0101])

and performs a function, such as displaying news headlines, or stock quotes (see

Chowdry, Fig 3). Therefore a portlet is an application. The system of Chowdry includes

a portal page which displays multiple portlets (see Fig 3), which can be stored in a

repository (see [0246]). The storage of portlets in a repository means the repository

contains a model of an application component. Furthermore, editing of portlets is

disclosed by Chowdry, see [0224] – [0228]. Therefore Chowdry disclosed a server

controller can modify a model of an application component on a server.

29.   Applicant further argues: "Chowdry fails to teach or suggest where the modifying

is in response to a modification-request generated by a client-controller" (pg 9, lines 20-

21).

        Examiner respectfully disagrees. In Chowdry the modification of a portlet may

come in the form of editing the portlet, or refreshing the portlet, both of which can be

initiated by a user at a client (see [0225] and [0245]). Therefore a client controller will

generate the modification request.

30.   Applicant further argues: "a portlet is not an application component on a server,

and a refreshing of that information as taught by Chowdry is not a modification to the

application component as presently claimed" (pg 10, lines 4-6).

        Examiner respectfully disagrees. An application, as defined by the IEEE

standard terms dictionary is: "A computer program that performs a function" (IEEE, pg

46, application, (5)). A portlet is a module of content information that can be retrieved

from web sources (see Chowdry, [0101]) and performs a function, such as displaying

news headlines, or stock quotes (see Chowdry, Fig 3). Therefore a portlet is an

application. The system of Chowdry includes a portal page which displays multiple

portlets (see Fig 3), which can be stored in a repository (see [0246]). The storage of

portlets in a repository means the repository contains a model of an application

component. Thus, the refreshing of a portlet is the modification to the application

component as claimed.

31.   Applicant further argues: "Chowdry is silent with respect to application

components, or the claimed feature of modifying an application component stored on a

server" (pg 11, 2nd full paragraph).

        Examiner respectfully disagrees. As noted above, a portlet falls within the

definition of an application. Furthermore, the editing of a portlet disclosed by Chowdry

at [0224] – [0228] is modifying an application component stored on a server in response

to a user request. And finally, the use of a cache server as disclosed by Chowdry at

[0220] – [0223] is also a modification of an application component, or portlet, stored on

a server. Therefore, Chowdry disclosed handling incremental data when modifying an

application component on a server.

32.   Applicant further argues: "Chowdry does not teach or suggest applications or

application components, and therefore fails to teach or suggest original models or

modified models of an application component" (pg 12, lines 12-14).

Examiner respectfully disagrees. An application, as defined by the IEEE

standard terms dictionary is: "A computer program that performs a function" (IEEE, pg

46, application, (5)). A portlet is a module of content information that can be retrieved

from web sources (see Chowdry, [0101]) and performs a function, such as displaying

news headlines, or stock quotes (see Chowdry, Fig 3). Therefore a portlet is an

application. The system of Chowdry includes a portal page which displays multiple

portlets (see Fig 3), which can be stored in a repository (see [0246]). The storage of

portlets in a repository means the repository contains a model of an application

component.

Furthermore, an original model of an application component can be the original

state of a portlet before a user generated refresh, or modification request (Chowdry,

[0243]). The updated model is then updated on the cache server (Chowdry, [0225]). In

addition, a user can edit a portlet, which is another method to update the original model

of a portlet as stored in a repository (Chowdry, [0224] – [0228]).

33.   Applicant further argues independent claims 1, 10, 11, 15 and 16 are allowable

for similar reasons to claim 22 (pg 11, first full paragraph – pg 12, second full

paragraph). Examiner respectfully disagrees, see above arguments and rejections.

34.   Applicant further argues dependent claims 2-9, 12-15 and 17-19 (pg 12, last

paragraph) are allowable because of their dependent nature on claims 1, 10, 11, 15 and

16. Examiner respectfully disagrees, see above arguments and rejections.

Conclusion

35.   **THIS ACTION IS MADE FINAL.** Applicant is reminded of the extension of time

policy as set forth in 37 CFR 1.136(a).

A shortened statutory period for reply to this final action is set to expire THREE

MONTHS from the mailing date of this action. In the event a first reply is filed within

TWO MONTHS of the mailing date of this final action and the advisory action is not

mailed until after the end of the THREE-MONTH shortened statutory period, then the

shortened statutory period will expire on the date the advisory action is mailed, and any

extension fee pursuant to 37 CFR 1.136(a) will be calculated from the mailing date of

the advisory action. In no event, however, will the statutory period for reply expire later than SIX MONTHS from the mailing date of this final action.

Any inquiry concerning this communication or earlier communications from the examiner should be directed to MATTHEW S. LINDSEY whose telephone number is (571)270-3811. The examiner can normally be reached on Mon-Thurs 7-5, Fridays 7-12.

If attempts to reach the examiner by telephone are unsuccessful, the examiner's supervisor, John Follansbee can be reached on (571) 272-3964. The fax phone number for the organization where this application or proceeding is assigned is 571-273-8300.

Information regarding the status of an application may be obtained from the Patent Application Information Retrieval (PAIR) system. Status information for published applications may be obtained from either Private PAIR or Public PAIR. Status information for unpublished applications is available through Private PAIR only. For more information about the PAIR system, see http://pair-direct.uspto.gov. Should you have questions on access to the Private PAIR system, contact the Electronic Business Center (EBC) at 866-217-9197 (toll-free). If you would like assistance from a USPTO Customer Service Representative or access to the automated information system, call 800-786-9199 (IN USA OR CANADA) or 571-272-1000.

MSL

12/10/2009

/John Follansbee/

Supervisory Patent Examiner, Art Unit 2451